REMARKS

1.   Summary of the Final Office Action Mailed November 6, 2009

In the final office action mailed November 6, 2009, with claims 18–22, 24–26, 28, 30–34, 36–38, and 40–41 pending, the Examiner:

(i)   rejected claims 18–19, 24, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,457 (Armentrout) and U.S. Patent No. 5,761,507 (Govett);

(ii)   rejected claims 20–21, 25, 30–33, 36–38, and 40–41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Armentrout, Govett, and U.S. Patent No. 6,112,225 (Kraft);

(iii)   rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Armentrout, Govett, and U.S. Patent No. 6,742,038 (Britt); and

(iv)   rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Armentrout, Govett, Kraft, and Britt.

2.   The Pending Claims

Presently pending in this application are claims 18–22, 24–26, 28, 30–34, 36–38, and 40–41, of which claims 18 and 30 are independent. Claims 18, 30–34, 36–38, and 40–41 are amended herein.

3.   Summary of December 23, 2009 Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for discussing this application during the December 23, 2009 interview. During that interview, Applicants and the Examiner discussed independent claims 18 and 30, and agreed that the references cited against the independent claims were for the purpose of showing that the "pertinent information" is an "identification of the requesting device." No agreement was reached with regard to independent claims 18 and 30.

4.   **Claims 18 and 30 are Patentable over Armentrout, Govett, and Kraft Because None of These References Disclose that "the pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" and a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device"**

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 18 and 30. The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armentrout and Govett, and rejected claim 30 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armentrout, Govett, and Kraft. Applicants submit that none of these references disclose that "the pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device," nor do the references disclose a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device," as recited in claims 18 and 30.

In contrast to disclosing that "the pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" and a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device," Govett discloses that a transaction manager receives a request from a client and directs the request to a server. The server processes the request and the result is returned to the client. However, "the servers are, in effect, unaware of the client identity (except for the destination of the results)." (col. 8, lines 3–5). Govett's disclosure that the servers may be aware of the destination of the results does not amount to Applicants' claimed "pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" because Govett fails to disclose that any information regarding the client except for the destination of the results, much less a type of a client, is passed to the server. Further, because the type of the requesting device is not passed to the Govett's server, the server does not perform a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device."

Additionally, in contrast to disclosing that "the pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" and a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device," Armentrout discloses that a client computer can specify the amount of computing power desired, the individual rating of computers that will execute the client's job, and how much memory and

disk space will be necessary. Specifying the computing power, individual ratings, memory, and disk space of the computer that will execute the client's job is not Applicants' claimed "pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" because Armentrout fails to disclose that any information regarding a client computer, much less a type of a client computer, is passed to the CTS. Because the type of the requesting device is not passed to the Armentrout's CTS, the CTS does not perform a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device,"

Further, in contrast to disclosing that "the pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" and a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device," Kraft discloses that the coordinating computer receives the aggregate task by, for example, an operator generating the task using the coordinating computer, manually copying the task into storage of the computer, or downloading the task onto the computer from a remote site. Receiving the aggregate task by, e.g., downloading the task from a remote website is not Applicant's claimed "pertinent information includes a type of the requesting device" because Kraft fails to disclose that any information regarding a requesting device, much less a type of a requesting device, is passed to the coordinating computer. Since the type of the requesting device is not passed to the Kraft's coordinating computer, the coordinating computer does not perform a "data conversion . . . based upon a type of the requesting device."

5. Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that independent claims 18 and 30 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 19–22, 24–26, 28, 31–34, 36–38, and 40–41 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect. The Examiner is

10

requested to contact Applicants' representative below if any questions arise or if he may be of

assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: January 6, 2010   By: /Alan W. Krantz/
                                         Alan W. Krantz
                                         Registration No. 64,900